

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 333

July 27, 1995, 10:14 a.m.
Page S-10754 Temp. Record

RYAN WHITE REAUTHORIZATION (AIDS)/Promoting Homosexuality-Drug Use

SUBJECT: Ryan White CARE Reauthorization Act of 1995 . . . S. 641. Helms amendment No. 1854.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 54-45

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 641, the Ryan White CARE Reauthorization Act of 1995, will authorize "such sums as may be necessary" through fiscal year (FY) 2000 for the Ryan White CARE Act.

The Helms amendment would add that "No funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used to promote or encourage, directly or indirectly, homosexuality or intravenous drug use." The term "to promote or encourage, directly or indirectly, homosexuality" would be defined to include: affirming homosexuality as natural, normal, or healthy; affirming in any way that engaging in a homosexual act is desirable, acceptable, or permissible; or describing in any way techniques of homosexual sex.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Federal Government has no business financing the promotion of homosexuality. Funds under this Act should be used to provide medical services, not to promote the very conduct which, according to the Centers for Disease Control, is responsible for more than half the AIDS cases in America. AIDS is not a civil rights issue, it is a public health issue, and it should not be used by homosexual activists to get taxpayer funding for lobbying to advance their perverse agenda. That lobbying with taxpayer money occurs, and it should be stopped. We therefore urge the adoption of this amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

Argument 1:

We agree that the Government should not be encouraging homosexual activity, and we add that we do not think it should be

(See other side)

YEAS (54)			NAYS (45)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (40 or 75%)		Democrats (14 or 30%)	Republicans (13 or 25%)	Democrats (32 or 70%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchison	Baucus	Campbell	Akaka	Kohl	Bennett- ²	
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Breaux	Chafee	Biden	Lautenberg		
Bond	Kempthorne	Bumpers	Cohen	Bingaman	Leahy		
Brown	Kyl	Byrd	D'Amato	Boxer	Levin		
Burns	Lott	Conrad	Gorton	Bradley	Lieberman		
Coats	Lugar	Dorgan	Hatfield	Bryan	Mikulski		
Cochran	Mack	Exon	Jeffords	Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Coverdell	McCain	Ford	Kassebaum	Dodd	Moynihan		
Craig	McConnell	Glenn	Packwood	Feingold	Murray		
DeWine	Murkowski	Heflin	Simpson	Feinstein	Nunn		
Dole	Nickles	Hollings	Snowe	Graham	Pell		
Domenici	Pressler	Johnston	Specter	Harkin	Reid		
Faircloth	Roth	Pryor	Thomas	Inouye	Robb		
Frist	Santorum	Rockefeller		Kennedy	Sarbanes		
Gramm	Shelby			Kerrey	Simon		
Grams	Smith			Kerry	Wellstone		
Grassley	Stevens						
Gregg	Thompson						
Hatch	Thurmond						
Helms	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

encouraging heterosexual activity either. The Helms amendment should not reference homosexual activity only. Additionally, we object to this amendment because we think its definition of homosexual activities is so broad that it may be construed to block funding from going to many of the organizations that are at the forefront in the medical fight against AIDS. Those organizations deal realistically with drug and homosexual practices. Their frank descriptions of these practices, which are used in prevention efforts, may well be interpreted as encouraging homosexuality under the Helms amendment. Therefore, because this amendment would only bar the promotion of homosexual activity instead of all sexual activity, and because its definition is so broad that it would prevent funding from going to some of the best organizations fighting AIDS, we must vote against it.

Argument 2:

Though we know it is not our colleagues' intent, this amendment would be cruel in effect. Under this amendment, a homosexual, suicidal teenager who went to an AIDS treatment center for counseling could not be told not to feel badly about his lifestyle, because that could be interpreted as being supportive of homosexuality. We cannot support such a result, and must therefore vote against this amendment.